



8-1-1970

Support or Nonthreat? An Investigation of an Ambiguity in the concept of the Ego Support Value

Valerie Lynn Hansen

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.und.edu/theses>

Recommended Citation

Hansen, Valerie Lynn, "Support or Nonthreat? An Investigation of an Ambiguity in the concept of the Ego Support Value" (1970). *Theses and Dissertations*. 3557.
<https://commons.und.edu/theses/3557>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, and Senior Projects at UND Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of UND Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact und.common@library.und.edu.

SUPPORT OR NONTHREAT? AN INVESTIGATION OF AN AMBIGUITY IN
THE CONCEPT OF THE EGO SUPPORT VALUE

by
Valerie Lynn Hansen

Bachelor of Science, University of North Dakota 1968

A Thesis
Submitted to the Faculty
of the
University of North Dakota
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
Master of Arts

Grand Forks, North Dakota

August
1970

This Thesis submitted by Valerie Lynn Hansen in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts from the University of North Dakota is hereby approved by the Faculty Advisory Committee under whom the work has been done.

Paul H. Wright
(Chairman)

Alice T. Clark

J. B. Cannon

William Johnson
Dean of the Graduate School

Permission

Title SUPPORT OR NONTHREAT? AN INVESTIGATION OF AN AMBIGUITY IN
THE CONCEPT OF THE EGO SUPPORT VALUE

Department PSYCHOLOGY

Degree MASTER OF ARTS

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a graduate degree from the University of North Dakota, I agree that the Library of this University shall make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for extensive copying for scholarly purposes may be granted by the professor who supervised my thesis work or, in his absence, by the Chairman of the Department or the Dean of the Graduate School. It is understood that any copying or publication or other use of this thesis or part thereof for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to the University of North Dakota in any scholarly use which may be made of any material in my thesis.

Signature _____

Date _____

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Paul Wright for his continued concern and guidance; Dr. John Carmen, and Dr. Alice Clark for their advice and valuable time extended on my behalf.

ABSTRACT

The investigation was designed to explore the concept of ego support. It was hypothesized that Wright's direct reward of ego support was not an unitary concept but a dual one, consisting of a support component and a comfort component. The investigation was divided into two parts: one part tested the independence of the two components; the second part attempted to determine if Target Persons independently designated as varying in comfort value and support value could be validly identified using the Acquaintance Description Form and a supplementary questionnaire. For Study II same sex, well acquainted pairs of subjects were asked to describe a Target Person, fitted a specified description, supplied by their partner. The results from Study I indicated that the two components were independent for male subjects. The same tendency appeared for females although here the two components showed less independence. Due primarily to the results of Study I, only female subjects were used in Study II. The following conclusions may be drawn: (1) it is possible to create positive and negative conditions of support and comfort; (2) the positive and the negative conditions result in differing degrees of friendship; (3) active support is more important for females than it is for males, and (4) the evidence indicates that ego support is a dual not an unitary concept but further research is needed in this area.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vi
ABSTRACT	vii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE AND STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM . .	4
III. METHOD	14
Instruments	
IV. RESULTS	21
V. DISCUSSION	28
VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	31
APPENDIX A	33
APPENDIX B	38
APPENDIX C	40
APPENDIX D	42
APPENDIX E	46
REFERENCES	49

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. INTERCORRELATIONS BETWEEN ALL VARIABLES FOR FEMALE SUBJECTS	23
2. INTERCORRELATIONS BETWEEN ALL VARIABLES FOR MALE SUBJECTS	23
3. MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF EACH ADF SCALE UNDER THE FOUR TREATMENT CONDITIONS	24

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Why do some people become friends and others not? This question of interpersonal attraction has interested psychologists for many years. There have been numerous attempts to fit this aspect of interpersonal attraction into an all encompassing theory. However, insufficiently understood methodologies and complex analyses of the obtained data have only added to the confusion (Cronbach, 1958).

For the most part prior researchers have developed global theories to explain interpersonal attraction. Winch's need-complementary theory proposes that complementary need-patterns are a prerequisite of attraction (Winch, Ktsanes, & Ktsanes, 1954). Izard (1960a, 1960b, 1963) conversely maintains that for attraction to occur there must be a similarity of personality characteristics.

Heider (1967) proposed a balance theory to explain interpersonal attraction. He assumed that " . . . people seek to develop an orderly and coherent view of their environment . . . " (Deutsch & Krause, 1965, p. 29). As such people tend to perceive positive attributes in others whom they like. Heider (1958, p. 25) states " . . . the sentiments [the way that one feels about something] and perceptions arrange themselves in such a way that simple harmonious configurations result." Therefore, if p (the subject) noticed that o (the other

person; liked by p) did something that p disliked, causing a disharmonious or unbalanced state, p would attempt to restore the balanced state (Heider, 1958). Newcomb expanded the balance hypothesis into his ABX system. In essence he talked about person A's perceptions of person B's attitudes toward X (either an object or another person). He also expanded the framework to include the concept of reciprocal rewards (Newcomb, 1961, 1967).

Byrne takes the position that the number of direct rewards or reinforcements bear a linear relationship to interpersonal attraction. Therefore, perceived or actual attitudinal similarity can be thought of as positively rewarding which would increase a person's attraction to another person (Byrne, 1961a; Byrne & Nelson, 1965). Perceived attitudinal similarity can override even racial prejudice (Byrne & Wong, 1962).

Wright (1968) noted that the data obtained, often inconsistent, defies attempts at integration into a coherent and manageable picture due to interpretational and methodological problems. Concluding that most investigators have concentrated on the antecedent conditions of attraction and not on the attraction itself, Wright (1969a) urged that a more stable criterion for assessing attraction must be developed. Such considerations led Wright to devise a model for assessing same sex friendships.

Wright's model for assessing same sex friendships includes two major variables (voluntary interdependence and difficult-to-maintain) and three direct rewards of the friendship (stimulation value, utility value, and ego support value). His definitions of these variables are

relatively clear cut. However, a closer examination of the ego support value raises some interesting questions. Just what is ego support? How does a person obtain ego support? Is there only one type of behavior that is ego supportive? From this one wonders what exactly does constitute ego supportive behavior. The present investigation is an attempt to gain a better understanding of ego supportive behavior. The author believes that ego support is not an unitary concept but a dual one, meaning that there are two distinct and separate types of ego support, i.e., a comfort component and a support component.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE AND STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Propinquity and Attraction

Probably, the most common sense beginning in the area of interpersonal attraction is a discussion of propinquity, i.e., the relationship between physical distance and interpersonal attraction. For any attraction to occur people must be close enough to interact. Lott and Lott (1965) in reviewing this concept cite many studies ranging from classroom situations to bomber crews that have supported the hypothesis that " . . . interpersonal attraction is a positive function of interaction . . . " (Lott & Lott, 1965, p. 260). Here, too, one cannot indiscriminately generalize as Festinger (Lott & Lott, 1965) showed. He found that negative feelings can occur if the interaction is forced. Lott and Lott (1965) stress the fact that while contact is important, attraction does not necessarily follow.

Need Complementarity and Need Similarity

Winch, Ktsanes and Ktsanes (1954) by modifying and simplifying Murray's need schema, have developed a need-complementary hypothesis for explaining interpersonal attraction. They state that " . . . the need-pattern of B, the second person or the one to whom the first is attracted will be complementary rather than similar to the need-pattern of A, the first person" (Winch, Ktsanes & Ktsanes, 1954, p. 242). Using

interspousal correlations on different personality characteristics such as dominance, succorance, et cetera, he found little or no direct support for this theory (Winch, 1955).

Izard (1960a, 1960b, 1963) maintains that for attraction to occur there must be a similarity of personality characteristics. He considers his approach to be antithetical to Winch's need-complementary hypothesis. A major determinant of attraction was assumed to be interpersonal positive affect. Izard (1960b, p. 484) argued that ". . . personality similarity facilitates the mutual expression of positive affect." Therefore it is assumed that persons with similar personality profiles will be attracted to each other. Banta and Heatherington (1963) supported the need-similarity hypothesis but could not find any consistent evidence for the need-complementary hypothesis.

Wright (1968) notes that the positions of need-similarity and need-complementarity hypotheses are not conceptually antithetical. The danger, as he views the problem, is the tendency to make global conclusions and to use methods which could introduce artifacts.

Cognitive Balance Models

According to Heider (1958) people strive to develop a coherent perception of their environment. In so doing, people develop a "naive psychology" which allows them to look beyond the surface behaviors of other people and seek causes for the behavior (Deutsch & Krauss, 1965). He also distinguishes between thing perception (nonsocial) and person perception (social). His logic is that objects are manipulanda while other people rarely are. As such, he regards people as "action centers" (Heider, 1967). Because of this, differing states of perceptual

balance are formed. A schematic conceptualization of the theory with p (the subject), o (the other person), and x (the act or object) would be such that if p likes x, and o likes x then p should like o, or if p dislikes x and o dislikes x then p should like o. But states of imbalance do occur (i.e., p likes x, p likes o, but o dislikes x). Such imbalance is accompanied by tension, and p will try to reduce this tension. P can do this in a number of ways; he can alter his feelings for either x or o, or he can change his conceptions as to the relevance of x. Using such a theoretical background Heider has made predictions about interpersonal attraction. Basically, people will be attracted to each other if mutual liking results in a balanced state between them (Heider, 1958, 1967).

Building upon Heider's premise of balance, Newcomb has formulated certain propositions pertaining to interpersonal communication. The more contact a person has with another the greater are his chances of liking that person. Newcomb explains this by introducing the concept of reward and punishment into his conceptualizations about interpersonal attraction. He states two assumptions of this principle:

. . . first, that when persons interact, the reward-punishment ratio is more often such as to be reinforcing than extinguishing; and second, that on-the-whole rewarding effects of interaction are most apt to be obtained from those with whom one interacts most frequently (Newcomb, 1967, p. 293).

Relevant attitudinal similarity between new acquaintances is rewarding, thus the interaction or communication between them will increase and hence it will increase the attraction. Such similarity may be assumed or actual but either is rewarding and would increase the attraction (Newcomb, 1967).

Newcomb assumes that the perceived similarity or dissimilarity must form a balanced or stable state, otherwise strain is introduced into the system. Newcomb regards strain as being driveline, i.e., arousing activities which would reduce the drive (Newcomb, 1961). For example, if A (the subject) is attracted to B (another person) but A and B have conflicting attitudes about X (some relevant topic) then strain is introduced. There are a number of ways open to A to reduce the resulting strain, i.e., he can change his attitude about X or its relevance to him, or he can reduce his attraction for B (Newcomb, 1961).

In testing his propositions he brought together groups of strangers who lived together in a co-op house for one semester. Here he demonstrated the importance of both actual and perceived similarity of attitudes on relevant topics in forming friendships (Newcomb, 1961).

Byrne's Reinforcement Model

Byrne believes that attitudinal similarity is rewarding and leads to attraction. Therefore, statements which are in agreement with a person's attitudes constitute positive reinforcement while those statements which disagree become negative reinforcements. Byrne concluded that attraction is a linear function of the proportion of agreeing statements to disagreeing statements (Byrne & Nelson, 1965).

Byrne first began by looking at the variable of propinquity with regard to interpersonal attraction. In two studies it was found that in college classrooms seat neighbors became acquainted more often (Byrne & Buehler, 1955) and that they formed closer relationships (Byrne, 1961b) than did non-seat neighbors. He hypothesized that attraction is determined by environmental variables which vary propinquity, the

strength of each person's affiliation motive, generalizations from previous learning and the amount of reciprocal rewards and punishments occurring during the interaction (Byrne, 1961a).

Byrne and Wong (1962) studied the effects that racial prejudice has on assumed attitudinal similarity or dissimilarity. They found that highly prejudiced white individuals assume more dissimilarity of attitudes when reacting to an unknown Negro than to an unknown white. They also demonstrated that strangers with similar attitudes to the subject were rated positively and that strangers with dissimilar attitudes were rated negatively regardless of the subject's personal prejudices or race. Therefore he concluded that " . . . attraction toward a stranger is a positive linear function of the proportion of that stranger's attitudes which are similar to those of the subject" (Byrne & Griffitt, 1966, p. 699). Byrne and Griffitt (1966) also demonstrated that such a relationship between positive and negative reinforcement and attraction holds for children in the same manner as for adults.

Wright's Friendship Model

In two initial studies Wright (1965, 1968) questioned the direction other studies had taken in dealing with interpersonal attraction. He pointed out salient criticisms concerning the interpretations and methodologies used. Prior interpretations, according to Wright (1968), consisted of two problem areas. Conceptually, the theoretical hypotheses offered were far too global. Such hypotheses did not offer the degree of specification required to talk about the conditions which would enhance attraction or the precise personality variables important to the area of attraction. Secondly, inconsistent results were reported

while using similar methodologies. The "jokers in the methodological deck" which Wright noted that often produced the misleading and/or inconsistent results were:

. . . (1) treating similarity (or complementarity) conceptually as if it were the independent variable but operationally (analytically) as if it were the dependent variable and, conversely, treating attraction conceptually as if it were the dependent variable but operationally as if it were the independent variable; and (2) using dyadic indices of similarity or complementarity, a practice about which Cronbach (1958) issued a cogent, well-illustrated cautionary note almost a decade ago (Wright, 1968, p. 127).

These problems, plus the desire to study the attraction and not the antecedent conditions of attraction, led Wright (1969a) to develop a new technique for studying friendship.

Noting that " . . . if one is interested in attraction within a particular kind of dyadic relationship a more stable criterion seems to be indicated" (Wright, 1969a, p. 197), so with such in mind Wright developed his friendship model. Here he concentrated on a specific, well-established relationship between same sexed pairs rather than on the attraction of a subject toward hypothetical strangers or new acquaintances.

The criterion of friendship is seen as the level of voluntary interdependence (VID) between a pair of acquaintances. He sees VID as being " . . . the degree to which the plans, activities, and decisions of one of the acquaintances are contingent upon those of the other when both members of the pair are free to exercise a certain amount of choice" (Wright, 1969a, p. 297). Since each member of the acquaintance pair has the freedom of choice, then a high level of VID would indicate a strong friendship. Likewise " . . . a developing friendship would be

reflected in an increasing level of VID, over time, and a deteriorating friendship in a decreasing level of VID (Wright, 1969a, p. 198)."

Observing that not all friendships are perfect and that even the best of friends can have disagreements, Wright (1969a) introduced, as a separate dimension, the difficult-to-maintain (DTM) variable into his friendship model. He defines DTM as:

. . . the degree that it [the friendship] is marked by misunderstandings, arguments, and hard-to-resolve disagreements and to the degree that the partners have to spend time clarifying communications, soothing ruffled feelings, and exercising restraint to keep the relationship intact (Wright, 1969a, p. 298).

Therefore, disagreement on relevant topics and issues does not mean non-attraction, but it may mean that the partners have to put forth more effort to maintain the friendship.

Not all people view friendship in the same way or expect to get the same benefits from a friendship, therefore, Wright incorporated three benefits or direct rewards of friendship into his model. They are stimulation value (SV), utility value (UV), and ego support value (ESV).

Stimulation value refers to the degree to which one person (the subject) sees another as interesting and imaginative, capable of introducing the subject to new ideas and activities, and capable of leading him into an expansion and elaboration of his present knowledge and outlook. Utility value refers to the degree to which the subject sees another person as cooperative, helpful, and, in general, willing to use his time and resources to help the subject meet his own personal goals and needs. Ego support value refers to the degree to which the subject sees another person as encouraging, supportive, nonthreatening, and, in general, capable of helping the subject feel more comfortable and maintain an impression of himself as a competent, worthwhile person (Wright, 1969a, p. 299).

These three values may, also, be thought of as mediating factors of a dyadic relationship which can facilitate or influence such "intraindividual characteristics" as personality variables.

Further Research

In two unpublished studies Wright has made further investigations, using his friendship model, in the area of interpersonal attractions of same sexed dyadic relationships (Wright, 1969b; Wright & Crawford, 1969).

The first study (Wright, 1969b) involved four investigations designed to assess the relationship between similarity on opinion, interest, and agreement measures and attraction. Well acquainted, same sexed pairs of volunteers enrolled in psychology classes were used as subjects. Two investigations in this series dealt with actual and perceived similarities of opinions. No relationships to any aspect of friendship was found (Wright, 1969b).

Studies 3 and 4 of the series concentrated on " . . . 1) preferences for specific day-to-day activities and 2) interests in more general areas of concern (Allport-Vernon-Lindzey values) [AVL]" (Wright, 1969b, Abstract). The results showed some striking sex differences in regard to same sex friendship pairings (see Wright, 1969b). For females both UV and ESV seem to be combined into a single factor of "overall supportiveness" which is related to agreement in general. For male subjects no such combining was seen and the UV and the ESV factors remain quite distinct entities (Wright, 1969b).

In the other unpublished study, Wright and Crawford (1969) investigated the sex differences which were seen in the above study. The assumption that " . . . men are more concerned with 'instrumental' or 'task' activities while women are more concerned with 'affective' or 'social-emotional' activities" (Wright & Crawford, 1969, p. 2) was the

starting point for the study. The subjects (same sex acquaintance pairs) were asked to supply their partner with the name of a person, who fit one of four brief descriptions using Wright's Acquaintance Description Form (ADF). The sketches were so designed as to describe a person as high or low with regard to "task" competence, or high or low with regard to "social-emotional" competence. The sex differences demonstrated were that men are more concerned with both "task" competence and "social-emotional" competence while women are mainly concerned with only "social-emotional" competence.

Questions about Ego Support

In reviewing the literature one finds that little separate treatment has been given to the concept of ego support. Wright (1968) has started by including ego support as a direct reward or benefit of friendship.

As presently conceptualized ego support is viewed as an unitary concept. However, a close examination of the Acquaintance Description Form (see Appendix A) reveals an ambiguity. The statements comprising the ego support scale deal mainly with the active or direct support given the friend (TP). For example, "If I have an argument or disagreement with someone, I can count on TP to stand behind me and give me support when he thinks that I am in the right" (see Appendix A, statement number 10). Most of the relevant statements are concerned with the giving of praise and advice.

But two statements (see Appendix A, statements numbers 16 and 34) are concerned with the ability of the TP to make the subject feel

comfortable and at ease around the TP. Implicit in these two statements is the concept of nonthreat. The TP does or says nothing which is threatening or uncomfortable to the subject.

If ego support is an unitary concept then why are two different aspects introduced into the ego support scale? From the present considerations it is uncertain whether ego support value refers to active support or to the absence of threat.

Statement of the Problem

From Wright's prior research there seems to be an ambiguity when one tries to conceptualize the ego support value. The problem that interested the author comes to light when considering this ESV. Is ego support the presence of active support of, or the absence of threat to an individual's ego? The present study is an attempt to gain a better understanding of ego supportive behavior as described by Wright's friendship model. It was predicted that the ego support value could be divided into two independent components, a comfort and a support component, and that these could be measured by the Acquaintance Description Form plus a supplementary questionnaire.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

Instruments

The Acquaintance Description Form

The friendship model is both a conceptual and a measurement approach to friendship, therefore, the instruments used in this study require special attention. The Acquaintance Description Form (ADF) was developed in conjunction with Wright's friendship model.

The ADF (see Appendix A), a person perception questionnaire, was developed by Wright (1969a). It is a sixty item questionnaire designed to measure the level of each of the components of Wright's friendship model that a subject associates with a specific acquaintance or Target Person (TP). The form consists of a separate scale for each component of Wright's friendship model; (1) the level of the friendship, voluntary interdependence (VID); (2) the difficult-to-maintain (DTM) variable; the direct rewards of the friendship; (3) stimulation value (SV); (4) utility value (UV); (5) ego support value (ESV).

Each item has four numbered or lettered alternatives and the subject circles the alternative of his choice. The response to each item is scored from 0 to 4. The scores of the relevant items are totaled to provide a raw score for each scale.

Wright has also included a general favorability scale containing ten generally positive, non-specific items. The raw score obtained

is used to correct for the halo effect, the tendency to view someone in an overly positive light, which occurs when people are asked to describe someone whom they like. The basic question of the present research deals with the conceptual properties of ESV, so it was necessary to develop a supplemental "comfort scale" for the ADF.

Development of the Comfort Value Scale

Using the existing items found on the ESV dimension of the ADF, the author then proceeded to develop additional items which would produce two separate scales, a comfort scale and a support scale, consisting of ten items each.

When this had been completed the resulting two scales were given to nineteen graduate students in psychology with the following instructions:

Read each of these statements carefully. Assume that each statement was made about a person (Target Person, TP) of your own sex and approximate age. Considering each statement independently, please indicate whether you would consider the TP to be someone who was supportive--non-supportive, or threatening--non-threatening. Please feel free to check the can't say alternative if there is much doubt one way or the other. Thank you.

The results were tallied and reviewed. During the reviewing it was decided that another sample population more similar to the one to be used in the actual study should be utilized. Therefore, it was decided that further refinement procedures would use students enrolled in the educational psychology classes. Thirty-seven subjects were given the questionnaire with slightly different instructions which are as follows:

Read the following statements carefully. Each statement has five alternatives. Indicate whether you would consider a friend of your own sex and approximate age (Target Person, TP) as being

supportive, non-supportive, threatening, or non-threatening. The fifth choice would indicate doubt one way or the other.

The results of this procedure were quite unclear. When looking at the instructions more closely it was decided that the subjects probably did not completely understand the instructions.

Volunteer subjects from the educational psychology classes were given a copy of the questionnaire and a set of written instructions. The instructions, with phrases omitted where the instructions varied, were as follows:

Read the following description keeping in mind that TP (Target Person) is a person of your own sex and approximate age . . .

Now, select 10 of the following 20 statements which you would consider the most descriptive of TP. Indicate your choice by placing a check at the left of the 10 most descriptive statements.

The instructions were varied to create two separate conditions. One condition was so designed to describe a "comfort" type of ego supportive Target Person and the other was designed to describe a "support" type of ego supportive Target Person. The specific wording of the instructions for each condition was as follows:

(comfort) TP can best be described as a real nice guy--pleasant, warm and accepting. Nobody needs to feel tense or uncomfortable when TP is around because he (she) has the knack for keeping almost any situation relaxed and pleasant.

(support) TP is the giver of sound advice even if it hurts at the time. He (She) may be considered a real "Ego Booster" always ready to give encouragement and praise.

Twelve subjects were instructed to think of a comfort TP and thirteen subjects were instructed to think of a support TP. These results were analyzed by means of the chi square method.

As the results show (see Appendix B), not all items were highly significant but with the exceptions of items 8, 12, 14, and 19 of the support component and items 5 and 9 of the comfort component the results

were in the desired direction. The comfort items 7 and 20 were scored in reverse which accounts for the opposite direction of these results. All items were retained in the two scales because it was felt that they were applicable even though this small sample does not provide strong support for all statements. The final form of the supplementary questionnaire (see Appendix C) was then used in conjunction with the ADF.

Studies of Comfort and Support Values

Overview

After the supplemental scale for the ADF had been developed, study I was designed to test the independence of the comfort and the support components of ESV. Subjects were asked to describe one of their best friends, good friends, or casual acquaintances. The differing conditions (i.e., best friend, good friend, or casual acquaintance) were used to insure a sample of the broad range of friendships. The results were analyzed correlationally. The correlation between the comfort component and the support component would indicate the independence or non-independence of the two components. If a high correlation ($r = 0.70$ or above) were obtained then one would have to conclude non-independence and that the ESV could not be divided into more specific components. If a low correlation ($r = 0.50$ or below) were obtained then one could conclude that the components of comfort and support of the ESV were sufficiently independent of each other to proceed to further studies.

Study II was designed to see if Target Persons independently designated as varying in comfort value and support value could be validly identified by appropriate scores on the ADF. The subjects reported

for the study in same sex, well acquainted pairs. They were asked to supply their partner with a name of a person who fitted a description of a specified Target Person. The descriptions were designed to yield two groups of contrasting levels of the comfort and the support components. This resulted in positive or negative comfort Target Persons, and positive or negative support Target Persons. This procedure would reveal that the two differently measured components of ESV could predict to different behavioral criteria. The results were analyzed by the analyses of variance.

Study I: Independence of Comfort
Value and Support Value

Forty-nine female and forty-nine male subjects, from an introductory psychology class, volunteered for the study. Participation in the study served as partial fulfillment of the subjects' course requirements. When they reported for the study each subject was given a copy of the Acquaintance Description Form, the supplementary questionnaire, an answer sheet, and a set of written instructions. The instructions were varied to create three different conditions constituting different levels of friendship; i.e., best friend, good friend, and casual acquaintance. The specific wording of the instructions was as follows:

(best friend) Think of a Target Person of your same sex and approximate age who you would consider one of your best friends. Use the ADF to describe this person. Write your name and the name of the person you will be describing on the ADF answer sheet.

(good friend) Think of a Target Person of your same sex and approximate age who is a good friend but not one of your best friends. Use the ADF to describe this person. Write your name and the name of the person you will be describing on the ADF answer sheet.

(casual acquaintance) Think of a Target Person of your same sex and approximate age with whom you are well acquainted but who you do not consider to be in your circle of friends. Use the ADF

to describe this person. Write your name and the name of the person you will be describing on the ADF answer sheet.

Each subject was given only one set of instructions. Seven male and ten female subjects were instructed to describe someone they considered to be one of their best friends. Thirty-three males and thirty-one females were instructed to describe someone they considered to be a good friend. Nine males and eight females were instructed to describe someone they considered to be just a casual acquaintance.

Study II: ADF Scores of Positive vs.
Negative Comfort Value Targets and
Positive vs. Negative Support
Value Targets

The results of Study I (see Results, page 22) showed stronger evidence for two separate components of ESV among males than among females. Because of this, and in addition to a lack of availability of male subjects, Study II was limited to female subjects only. Forty female subjects, undergraduate students enrolled in psychology classes and graduate students in Guidance and Counseling, volunteered for the study. For the undergraduate students enrolled in psychology classes, participation in the study served as partial fulfillment of their course requirements. The subjects were asked to report for the study in same sex well acquainted pairs. Each subject in the pair was given a copy of the ADF, the supplementary questionnaire, the answer sheet, and a set of written instructions. The written instructions, with phrases omitted where the instructions varied, were as follows:

Please give your partner the name of a person other than yourself to describe using the Acquaintance Description Form. This should be a person of his or her own sex, and someone that you know your partner . . .

Do not tell your partner what kind of person his Target Person is supposed to be; simply give him the name of someone you feel fits the instruction. DO THIS BY WRITING THE NAME OF THE TARGET PERSON ON THE ANSWER SHEET, THEN HAND THE ANSWER SHEET TO YOUR PARTNER. Your partner has been asked to give you the name of a Target Person to describe. In all probability, his instructions are different from yours. It will be best if you do not try to figure out the instructions; just fill out the Acquaintance Description Form about your Target Person as well as you can.

The instructions were varied to create four different response conditions with respect to the kind of Target Person subjects were to supply to their partners. The four conditions were designed to form two sets of contrasting conditions; i.e., a positive and a negative comfort component and a positive and a negative support component. The specific wording for each condition was as follows:

(positive comfort) regards to be a very comfortable person to be around. TP is someone your partner considers a warm and accepting person. He (She) almost never criticizes, blames, or belittles the things your partner does or says. If your partner does something "off-beat" or "silly," he just shrugs it off.

(negative comfort) regards to be very uncomfortable to be around. TP is someone your partner considers a very cold and unaccepting person. He (She) almost always criticizes and belittles the things your partner does or says. If your partner does something "off-beat" or "silly" he (she) makes a big deal out of it.

(positive support) regards to be a very complimentary and "ego-boosting" person. Someone who is able to make your partner feel really good about his (her) abilities and accomplishments. TP is someone who always notices the worthwhile things your partner does and says, and is free with words of praise and encouragement.

(negative support) regards to be a very uncomplimentary and "ego-deflating" person. TP is someone who has the knack of seeing the bad side of everything. He (She) is someone who rarely notices the worthwhile things your partner does or says, and almost never praises or encourages your partner.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Treatment of the Data

In Study I the results were analyzed correlationally. The intercorrelations between each variable and every other variable were computed. This procedure was used as a measure of the independence of the support and the comfort components of ESV. The major emphasis was placed on ESV but as a check on the sample all intercorrelations were computed. In this way one could check back and compare the results with Wright's prior findings and determine if a comparable sample was drawn.

The data obtained from Study II were analyzed by means of analyses of variance. The technique chosen was the one way analysis of variance. In the final study there were seven variables, i.e., GF; VID; SV; UV; DTM; SUP (the support component), and COM (the comfort component), and four treatment levels, i.e., + SUP; - SUP; + COM; and - COM. In order to determine the effect of the different treatment levels on each of the variables it was decided to analyze each variable separately in regard to the four treatment levels. Therefore, seven one way analyses of variance were computed.

Internal comparisons were made between those means where there appeared a possibility of a significant difference. In total, five such comparisons were made. The Student's *t* for two independent means

was the method used. Due to the large number of such comparisons, the significance level for those internal comparisons was set at 0.025.

Study I

Total raw score scale values for each subject were computed and then corrected for the general favorability factor. The corrected scale scores can be found in Appendix D. These scale scores were then analyzed correlationally. The general favorability factor was also included as a precautionary measure to determine if this factor was being effectively corrected for. Data from male and female subjects were analyzed separately.

Table 1 shows the intercorrelations among all variables for female subjects and Table 2 shows the intercorrelations among all variables for male subjects. In comparison with prior results obtained by Wright (1969a) there are no appreciable differences in regard to the intercorrelations of the first five variables (GF; VID; SV; UV; DTM). No such conclusions can be drawn concerning the last two variables (SUP and COM) as no prior research has been done in this area. It can also be concluded that the general favorability factor is being effectively corrected for.

The major concern was to check the independence of the support component and the comfort component of ESV. For male subjects the correlation between the support and the comfort components is 0.20. The probability that the components are non-independent of each other is very slight, therefore, independence can be assumed. For females the intercorrelation between the support and the comfort components is 0.49. This correlation is not low enough to assure independence of the two

TABLE 1

INTERCORRELATIONS BETWEEN ALL VARIABLES FOR FEMALE SUBJECTS

	GF	VID	SV	UV	DTM	SUP	COM
GF		.41	.17	.14	-.36	.01	.03
VID			.31	.63	-.30	.61	.33
SV				.39	-.04	.33	-.12
UV					-.25	.69	.42
DTM						-.33	-.51
SUP							.49
COM							

TABLE 2

INTERCORRELATIONS BETWEEN ALL VARIABLES FOR MALE SUBJECTS

	GF	VID	SV	UV	DTM	SUP	COM
GF		.54	.01	.02	.13	-.01	.02
VID			.47	.44	.06	.26	.17
SV				.38	.12	.18	.16
UV					-.03	.44	.25
DTM						.08	-.22
SUP							.20
COM							

components of ESV but it is low enough to allow for further research in this area.

Study II

The total raw scores for each ADF variable were computed and corrected for the general favorability factor. The corrected scale scores can be found in Appendix E. Since there were seven variables and four differing conditions, seven one way analyses of variance were computed.

Table 3 summarizes the results of Study II. It includes the means and standard deviations for each of the variables under the experimental conditions and the resulting F-ratios of the analyses.

TABLE 3
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF EACH ADF SCALE
UNDER THE FOUR TREATMENT CONDITIONS

		ADF Scales						
Conditions		GF (1)	VID (2)	SV (3)	UV (4)	DTM (5)	SUP (6)	COM (7)
+SUP	Means	33.90	27.00	23.60	20.60	18.80	20.00	20.40
	SD	6.15	7.93	5.52	3.03	3.88	3.56	4.35
-SUP	Means	19.80	9.10	14.70	14.10	23.40	10.70	15.80
	SD	4.52	5.88	5.60	5.63	8.54	6.38	6.48
+COM	Means	32.60	26.70	21.50	18.50	16.20	17.60	21.70
	SD	5.58	5.38	6.13	4.48	3.80	3.37	2.63
-COM	Means	14.9	7.80	15.90	14.90	23.10	13.90	20.20
	SD	6.61	4.42	4.91	4.23	7.70	5.22	6.97
F-Ratio		26.61 ^a	31.03 ^a	5.99 ^b	4.75 ^b	2.57	7.29 ^b	2.27

^a_p >.001

^b_p >.01

General favorability and voluntary interdependence. The

F-ratios for the general favorability factor and the VID variable (the criterion of the friendship) (GF, 26.61; and VID, 31.03) are highly significant ($p > .001$). An examination of the means for these two ADF scales reveals that subjects rate the TP who is either positively supporting or positively comforting as a much better friend and will rate

him more positively in general than a TP who is either non-supporting or non-comforting.

An internal comparison between the means of the Negative Support value and the Negative Comfort value was computed. The resulting t-score was 1.899 with 36 degrees of freedom. This value does not meet the criterion level of significance ($p = .025$).

Stimulation value. The third analysis was concerned with the level of the stimulation value across the four conditions. An F-ratio of 5.99 ($p > .01$) was obtained. This indicates that the Negative Support and the Negative Comfort Target Persons are seen as less stimulating by the subject. A t-test between the means of the Positive Support and the Positive Comfort conditions indicates that stimulation value does not differ significantly between these two conditions ($t = .843$; $p < .05$).

Utility value. The fourth analysis compared means on the utility value scale across the four conditions. The computed F-ratio was 4.75 ($p > .01$). This analysis indicates that subjects view Target Persons under the Positive Support and Positive Comfort conditions as more helpful and able to do more for them than are Target Persons under the Negative Support and the Negative Comfort conditions. A t-test comparing the Positive Support and the Positive Comfort UV means was non-significant ($t = 1.06$; $p < .05$).

The difficult-to-maintain variable. The fifth analysis assessed the variance of the DTM variable across the four experimental conditions. The resulting F-ratio was 2.57 ($.05 > p > .10$), therefore,

no definitive statements can be made. Tentatively it appears that TP is harder to get along with if he is non-supportive or non-comforting (i.e., threatening).

Support value. The sixth analysis is of major importance because the support component of ESV is assessed in terms of the four experimental conditions. The computed F-ratio was 7.29 ($p > .001$). This indicates that those Target Persons who are in the Positive Support and Positive Comfort conditions are perceived as being much more ego supportive than those Target Persons who are in the Negative Support and the Negative Comfort conditions. Calculations were made of t-tests between the means of the Positive Support and the Positive Comfort conditions, and the Negative Support and the Negative Comfort conditions. Respective t-scores of 1.12 and 1.49 were found. Neither of these t-scores approached an acceptable significance level. The different conditions do not differ significantly as to which positive condition produces the most or which negative condition produces the least ego supportive Target Person. However, the mean values and the standard deviations of each of the four conditions do indicate some trends. The mean of the Positive Support condition ($\bar{X} = 20.00$) was higher than the mean of the Positive Comfort condition ($\bar{X} = 17.60$). Also the mean of the Negative Support condition ($\bar{X} = 10.70$) was the lowest of the treatment groups coupled with the largest amount of within group variability ($SD = 6.38$).

Comfort value. The last analysis computed was the comfort component of ESV with respect to the four experimental conditions. The

resulting F-ratio was 2.27 which was significant only at the .10 level. This analysis resulted in very little, if any, meaningful information. It did not turn out as expected. Therefore, no definite conclusions can be reached.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The most significant results from Study II were that the positive conditions uniformly differed from the negative conditions. Across all analyses, except for DTM, the means for the positive conditions were higher than the means for the negative conditions. Since DTM is negatively related to friendship the means for the four conditions varied accordingly.

From Study I, with regard to females, it appears that active support (the support component) differs from passive support (the comfort of "non-threat" component). An examination of Table 2 shows that the support scale correlates appreciably higher with UV, SV, and VID than does the comfort scale with these same variables.

For male subjects (see Table 3) the corresponding correlational differences are not nearly so large. This indicates that for men, active support and passive support do not differ appreciably in terms of their effects on the friendship relationship. However, female subjects tend to see an actively supporting Target Person as more interesting, stimulating, cooperative, helpful, and in general, a better friend than a passively supporting or non-threatening individual. In short, females view active support as more important to friendship than mere passive support or non-threateningness.

Study II further supports the conclusion that females regard active support as being more important than passive support. Note that there are sharper contrasts between the support versus non-support conditions than the Comfort versus Non-comfort conditions for both the support scale and the comfort scale (see Table 3, columns 6 and 7). One striking result is that the lowest comfort value mean occurs under the condition of Negative Supportiveness rather than Negative Comfort. Newcomb's idea that communication is an important aspect of friendship, could serve as a possible explanation for this. A non-supportive Target Person is also non-communicative, while a threatening is not necessarily non-communicative. Therefore, it is possible that communication even though it is not always positive is more important than the absence of communication.

Study II also provides evidence for the independence of the comfort and the support scales. The mean difference is greater for the positive versus negative support condition than for the positive versus negative comfort condition. This outcome, though not statistically significant, is precisely what one would expect if ADF ratings truly differentiated between "supportiveness-non-supportiveness" and "comfort-threateningness." In addition, the mean of the support scale is lower than the mean of the comfort scale under the condition of Positive Comfort. This indicates that a Target Person described under the Positive Comfort condition is seen as comforting and non-threatening but not necessarily supportive. Also the mean of the support scale is lower than the mean of the comfort scale under the Negative Support condition.

Therefore, a Target Person described under the Negative Support condition can be perceived as non-threatening even though he is described as non-supportive.

Since the present investigation was concerned mainly with the support and the comfort components of ESV in relation to same sexed female friendships, the following conclusions may be drawn: (1) it is possible to set up positive and negative conditions of support and comfort; (2) the positive and the negative conditions result in different degrees of friendship; (3) active support is more important than passive support for females than it is for males; and (4) the evidence indicates that the support component and the comfort component of ESV are independent of each other but further research is needed in this area.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The present investigation was an attempt to gain a better understanding of ego support. As defined by Wright (1969a) in his friendship model, an ambiguity concerning the ego support value is seen. Just what constitutes ego support? Is it an unitary or a dual concept? It was hypothesized that ego support is a dual concept consisting of a support component and a comfort component. Since the original ego support scale was mainly concerned with the support aspect of ego support, it was necessary to develop a supplementary questionnaire which would create two separate scales, i.e., a support scale and a comfort scale.

The present investigation was divided into two parts: part one was designed to determine if the support component and the comfort component were independent of each other, the second part was an attempt to determine if Target Persons independently designated as varying in comfort value and support value could be validly identified by appropriate scores on the Acquaintance Description Form and the supplementary questionnaire.

In Study I, each subject was asked to describe a same sexed Target Person who they considered to be either a best friend, a good friend, or a casual acquaintance. Subjects reported for Study II in same sex, well acquainted pairs. Each subject was asked to supply his

partner with a Target Person who he felt that his partner regarded as fitting a specified description. With each subject given only the name of a Target Person, he described that Target Person using the Acquaintance Description Form and the supplementary questionnaire.

From Study I it appeared that the two components were independent for the male subjects. For female subjects this tendency was seen but it was a much weaker finding. Because of these results and the unavailability of male subjects, Study II was limited to females only. Study II demonstrated that it is possible to create positive and negative conditions of the support and the comfort components and that these positive and negative conditions result in differing degrees of friendship. It also appears that active support is more important for females than it is for males. The hypothesis of this investigation was not strongly supported although the evidence would seem to indicate that ego support can not be regarded as an unitary concept. Further research in this area is needed before final conclusions can be drawn.

APPENDIX A

ACQUAINTANCE DESCRIPTION FORM

Statements

This form lists some statements about your reactions to an acquaintance called the Target Person (TP). Please indicate your reaction to each statement on the special answer sheet you have been given. Perhaps some of the situations described have never come up in your relationship with TP. If this happens, try your best to imagine what things would be like if this situation did come up.

1. TP can come up with thoughts and ideas that give me new and different things to think about.
2. If I were short of cash and needed money in a hurry, I could count on TP to be willing to loan it to me.
3. TP's ways of dealing with people make him (or her) rather difficult to get along with.
4. TP has a lot of respect for my ideas and opinions.
5. TP is a conscientious person.
6. If I hadn't heard from TP for several days without knowing why, I would make it a point to contact him (her) just for the sake of keeping in touch.
7. When we get together to work on a task or project, TP can stimulate me to think of new ways to approach jobs and solve problems.
8. If I were looking for a job, I could count on TP to try his best to help me find one.
9. I can count on TP's being very easy to get along with, even when we disagree about something.
10. If I have an argument or disagreement with someone, I can count on TP to stand behind me and give me support when he thinks I am in the right.
11. TP is fair and open-minded.
12. If I had a choice of two good part-time jobs, I would seriously consider taking the somewhat less attractive job if it meant that TP and I could work at the same place.

13. TP is the kind of conversationalist who can make me clarify and expand my own ideas and beliefs.
14. TP is willing to use his skills and abilities to help me reach my own personal goals.
15. I can count on having to be extra patient with TP to keep from giving up on him (her) as a friend.
16. I can converse freely and comfortably with TP without worrying too much about being teased or criticized if I unthinkingly say something pointless, inappropriate, or just plain silly.
17. TP is emotionally steady and even-tempered.
18. If TP and I could arrange our class or work schedules so we each had a free day, I would try to arrange my schedule so that I had the same free day as TP.
19. TP can get me involved in interesting new activities that I probably wouldn't consider if it weren't for him.
20. TP is a good, sympathetic listener when I have some personal problem I want to talk over with someone.
21. I can count on having to go out of my way to do things that will keep my relationship with TP from "falling apart."
22. If I accomplish something that makes me look especially competent or skillful, I can count on TP to notice it and appreciate my ability.
23. TP is a hard-working person.
24. If I had decided to leave town on a certain day for a leisurely trip or vacation and discovered that TP was leaving for the same place a day later, I would seriously consider waiting a day in order to travel with him (her).
25. When we discuss beliefs, attitudes and opinions, TP introduces viewpoints that help me to see things in a new light.
26. I can count on TP to be a good contact person in helping me to meet worthwhile people and make social connections.
27. I have to be very careful about what I say if I try to talk to TP about topics he considers controversial or touchy.
28. TP has confidence in my advice and opinions about practical matters and personal problems.
29. TP is a very well-mannered person.

30. When I plan for leisure time activities, I make it a point to get in touch with TP to see if we can arrange to do things together.
31. I can count on TP to be ready with really good suggestions when we are looking for some activity or project to engage in.
32. If I have some more or less serious difference with a friend or acquaintance, TP is a good person for acting as a go-between in helping me to smooth out the difficulty.
33. I have a hard time really understanding some of TP's actions and comments.
34. If I am in an embarrassing situation, I can count on TP to do things that will make me feel as much at ease as possible.
35. TP is an intellectually well-rounded person.
36. If I had no particular plans for a free evening and TP contacted me suggesting some activity I am not particularly interested in, I would seriously consider doing it with him.
37. TP has a way of making ideas and topics that I usually consider useless and boring seem worthwhile and interesting.
38. If I were short of time or faced with an emergency, I could count on TP to help with errands or chores to make things as convenient for me as possible.
39. I can count on TP's acting tense or upset with me without my knowing what I've done to bother him (her).
40. If I have some success or good fortune, I can count on TP to be happy and congratulatory about it.
41. TP is a tactful person.
42. TP is one of the persons I would go out of my way to help if he were in some sort of difficulty.
43. TP can come up with good, challenging questions and ideas.
44. TP is willing to spend time and energy to help me succeed at my own personal tasks and projects, even if he is not directly involved.
45. I can count on TP's being willing to listen to my explanations in a patient and understanding way when I've done something to rub him (her) the wrong way.
46. When we discuss beliefs, attitudes and opinions, TP listens and reacts as if my thoughts and ideas make a lot of sense.

47. TP is generous.
48. If I had just gotten off work or out of class and had some free time, I would wait around and leave with TP if he were leaving the same place an hour or so later.
49. TP is the kind of person from whom I can learn a lot just by listening to him talk or watching him work on problems.
50. I can count on TP to be willing to loan me personal belongings (for example, his books, car, typewriter, tennis racket) if I need them to go somewhere or get something done.
51. I can count on communication with TP to break down when we try to discuss things that are touchy or controversial.
52. TP considers me a good person to have around when he needs someone to talk things over with.
53. TP is a thoughtful person.
54. I try to get interested in the activities that TP enjoys, even if they do not seem especially appealing to me at first.
55. TP is the kind of person who is on the lookout for new, interesting and challenging things to do.
56. If I were sick or hurt, I could count on TP to do things that would make it easier to take.
57. I can count on TP to misunderstand me and take my actions and comments the wrong way.
58. I can count on TP to come up with really valuable advice when I need help with practical problems or predicaments.
59. TP is a helpful, cooperative person.
60. If TP and I were planning vacations to the same place and at about the same time and he had to postpone his trip for a month, I would seriously consider postponing my own trip for a month also.

APPENDIX B

RAW DATA, CHI SQUARE VALUES, AND SIGNIFICANT LEVELS FOR THE SUPPORT SCALE AND THE COMFORT
SCALE UNDER THE TWO EXPERIMENTAL CONDITIONS

		Items																			
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
SUPPORT	TP, Applicable	10	7	7	5	3	10	1	6	6	10	5	6	9	6	2	8	9	3	4	2
SUPPORT	TP, Non-Applicable	2	5	5	7	9	2	11	6	6	2	7	6	3	6	10	4	3	9	8	10
SUPPORT	TP, Chi square	2.67	1.67	1.67	1.67	1.50	2.67	4.17	0.00	0.0	2.67	1.67	.00	1.5		2.67	0.67	1.50	1.50	.67	1.67
SUPPORT	TP, Significance	p > .2	.2	.2	.2	.3	.2	.05			.2	.2		.3		.2	.5	.3	.3	.5	.2
COMFORT	TP, Non-applicable	7	3	6	4	9	6	12	6	9	7	6	8	0	8	6	3	5	5	6	13
COMFORT	TP, Applicable	6	10	7	9	4	7	1	7	4	6	7	5	13	5	7	10	8	8	6	0
COMFORT	TP, Chi square	.038	1.88	.038	.96	.96	.038	4.65	.038	.96	.038	.038	.35	6.5	.35	.038	1.88	.35	.35		6.5
COMFORT	TP, Significance	p > .9	.2	.9	.5	.5	.9	.05	.9	.5	.9	.9	.9	.02	.9	.9	.2	.9	.9		.02

APPENDIX C

SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONNAIRE

61. It would surprise me if TP "blew his (her) stack" or really got angry with me.

e d c b a

62. TP considers me a worthwhile person.

e d c b a

63. TP is the kind of person who tries to "get the better" of me.

4 3 2 1 0

64. TP is very patient with me.

4 3 2 1 0

65. If I were undecided about a problem, TP would be willing to help me solve it.

e d c b a

66. I can count on TP not to be overly critical when I do something he (she) considers "bad" or in poor taste.

4 3 2 1 0

67. I feel at ease when I am around TP.

4 3 2 1 0

68. TP is willing to "stick his (her) neck out" for me.

4 3 2 1 0

69. I can count on TP not to "bug" or criticize me about little things.

e d c b a

70. It would surprise me if TP tried to force his (her) advice on me.

e d c b a

71. I can count on TP to be "pushy" or offensive when he (she) is trying to convince me about something.

4 3 2 1 0

APPENDIX D

RAW DATA FROM STUDY I

<u>Males</u>	<u>GF</u>	<u>VID</u>	<u>SV</u>	<u>UV</u>	<u>DTM</u>	<u>SUP</u>	<u>COM</u>
1	2	1	16	17	11	23	17
2	31	3	10	10	28	23	20
3	32	19	17	24	23	26	20
4	25	20	11	27	20	19	18
5	39	33	25	20	22	18	25
6	27	28	18	19	21	19	21
7	27	25	25	23	21	24	20
8	9	11	13	16	23	20	15
9	30	26	34	20	14	15	21
10	28	35	25	28	23	26	19
11	27	17	11	25	13	22	14
12	29	22	16	20	13	23	23
13	19	24	27	19	36	13	12
14	18	18	13	21	20	18	13
15	32	26	22	20	21	21	20
16	30	34	19	21	21	22	23
17	28	27	19	27	21	24	24
18	29	22	20	15	19	19	14
19	25	13	21	22	24	29	15
20	10	17	18	15	12	26	22
21	38	24	12	13	18	18	15
22	28	23	19	21	18	24	22
23	23	28	21	22	13	11	20
24	30	26	19	16	23	25	19
25	22	17	17	28	22	20	22
26	26	25	27	27	24	25	26
27	28	25	24	19	13	21	24
28	31	34	15	29	13	29	22
29	24	24	22	15	17	20	21
30	37	28	16	16	18	21	21
31	14	28	26	26	21	24	22
32	23	27	21	21	22	19	27
33	12	9	20	14	19	20	27
34	25	11	12	22	26	21	14
35	35	20	24	19	18	22	17
36	25	5	10	8	20	12	12
37	29	14	8	18	18	16	26
38	24	18	19	21	21	20	24
39	36	34	22	26	20	23	15
40	31	21	15	20	23	23	21
41	26	14	21	15	18	16	11

<u>Males</u>	<u>GF</u>	<u>VID</u>	<u>SV</u>	<u>UV</u>	<u>DTM</u>	<u>SUP</u>	<u>COM</u>
42	31	23	13	20	14	14	20
43	30	31	19	22	18	23	20
44	34	26	20	19	23	20	15
45	33	21	8	8	21	11	19
46	33	30	21	16	22	22	15
47	30	35	23	18	32	20	15
48	34	29	17	18	23	19	22
49	28	22	16	18	17	17	18

<u>Females</u>	<u>GF</u>	<u>VID</u>	<u>SV</u>	<u>UV</u>	<u>DTM</u>	<u>SUP</u>	<u>COM</u>
1	36	24	2	17	14	16	23
2	25	7	19	6	30	5	10
3	20	12	19	13	14	22	24
4	36	29	24	18	19	24	21
5	37	20	20	12	14	20	19
6	32	18	11	12	25	12	11
7	23	7	13	10	33	12	22
8	37	26	15	17	22	14	22
9	30	19	20	23	10	22	23
10	30	40	29	17	23	20	27
11	34	36	21	24	12	26	27
12	28	39	12	25	17	31	33
13	37	29	20	18	14	21	20
14	36	30	29	16	19	26	22
15	27	26	21	21	27	25	22
16	32	32	26	25	21	22	22
17	33	24	24	23	15	21	25
18	34	16	30	23	22	25	17
19	32	22	19	19	13	22	29
20	31	23	22	19	21	15	17
21	38	33	25	24	14	23	18
22	33	25	26	18	12	16	23
23	37	19	13	12	16	13	23
24	40	27	18	17	22	18	17
25	38	28	29	25	19	19	21
26	36	20	17	17	14	22	23
27	33	21	26	24	29	20	9
28	24	26	13	26	24	26	24
29	35	31	21	19	24	22	20
30	36	22	21	12	29	17	16
31	34	24	16	13	21	19	19
32	25	23	25	21	14	26	19
33	36	32	27	23	21	24	24
34	32	20	25	20	25	23	23
35	27	17	14	21	21	14	21
36	31	14	16	14	19	14	16
37	30	32	19	26	19	25	22

<u>Females</u>	<u>GF</u>	<u>VID</u>	<u>SV</u>	<u>UV</u>	<u>DTM</u>	<u>SUP</u>	<u>COM</u>
38	31	33	19	26	13	25	19
39	37	29	20	22	16	17	21
40	21	21	22	21	26	26	19
41	24	15	12	13	29	16	17
42	22	18	15	13	26	16	16
43	36	28	23	25	20	19	19
44	35	26	15	16	14	22	21
45	29	21	21	22	25	19	21
46	33	25	21	11	25	21	10
47	36	28	14	21	30	21	19
48	32	22	24	16	31	16	15
49	22	27	21	21	25	20	17

APPENDIX E

RAW DATA FROM STUDY II

<u>CONDITIONS</u>	<u>GF</u>	<u>VID</u>	<u>SV</u>	<u>UV</u>	<u>DTM</u>	<u>SUP</u>	<u>COM</u>
+ SUP							
1	30	16	16	15	18	18	17
2	26	36	30	24	27	16	14
3	23	17	26	19	18	27	29
4	38	27	38	21	21	21	22
5	30	22	16	19	21	16	20
6	40	39	29	23	20	19	22
7	40	34	25	17	13	17	22
8	38	21	28	24	16	21	20
9	38	30	19	22	15	21	23
10	36	28	19	22	19	24	15
- SUP							
1	23	7	12	7	19	5	19
2	26	13	12	11	31	13	11
3	19	8	13	15	30	10	16
4	22	1	2	8	33	2	12
5	16	6	14	12	31	6	7
6	17	7	22	16	8	18	30
7	17	7	19	20	18	22	21
8	20	7	18	10	19	8	17
9	26	23	16	25	22	16	12
10	12	12	19	17	13	7	13
+ COM							
1	21	19	17	21	13	19	25
2	39	38	26	23	16	22	24
3	33	30	24	25	15	21	29
4	27	28	31	19	22	20	22
5	36	27	22	15	23	15	29
6	30	27	26	20	15	15	19
7	35	28	20	15	14	20	21
8	39	20	9	10	18	12	19
9	35	27	17	21	11	18	24
10	31	23	23	16	15	14	25

<u>CONDITIONS</u>	<u>GF</u>	<u>VID</u>	<u>SV</u>	<u>UV</u>	<u>DTM</u>	<u>SUP</u>	<u>COM</u>
- COM							
1	13	16	24	22	28	12	16
2	12	13	18	17	7	17	28
3	22	9	5	17	33	24	16
4	24	10	17	6	19	9	15
5	25	7	12	14	24	18	31
6	8	4	16	15	14	5	13
7	9	6	15	18	28	14	28
8	15	3	17	13	22	15	13
9	14	8	16	12	25	14	17
10	7	2	19	15	21	11	25

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Banta, T. J., & Heatherington, M. Relations between needs of friends and fiances. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 66, 401-404.
- Byrne, D., & Buehler, J. A. A note on the influence of propinquity upon acquaintanceships. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1955, 51, 147-148.
- Byrne, D. Interpersonal attraction and attitude similarity. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 62, 713-715. (a)
- Byrne, D. The influence of propinquity and opportunities for interaction on classroom relationships. Human Relations, 1961, 14, 63-70. (b)
- Byrne, D., & Wong, T. J. Racial prejudice, interpersonal attractions, and assumed dissimilarity of attitudes. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1962, 65, 246-253.
- Byrne, D., & Nelson, D. Attraction as a linear function of positive and negative reinforcements. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 1, 659-663.
- Byrne, D., & Griffitt, W. A developmental investigation of the law of attraction. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 4, 699-702.
- Cronbach, L. J. Proposals leading to the analytic treatment of social perception scores. In R. Taguiri & L. Petrullo (Eds.), Person Perception and Interpersonal Behavior, Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1958, 353-380.
- Deutsch, M., & Krauss, R. M. Theories in Social Psychology, New York: Basic Books, 1965.
- Heider, F. Perceiving the other person. In R. Taguiri & L. Petrullo (Eds.), Person Perception and Interpersonal Behavior, Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1958, 22-26.
- Heider, F. Perceiving the other person. In E. P. Hollander & R. G. Hunt (Eds.), Current Perspectives in Social Psychology. (2nd ed.) New York: Oxford University Press, 1967, 305-317.

- Izard, C. Personality similarity and friendship. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1960, 61, 47-51. (a)
- Izard, C. Personality similarity, positive affect, and interpersonal attraction. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1960, 61, 484-485. (b)
- Izard, C. Personality similarity and friendship: A follow-up study. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 66, 598-600.
- Lott, A. J., & Lott, B. E. Group cohesiveness as interpersonal attraction: A review of relationships with antecedent and consequent variables. Psychological Bulletin, 1965, 64, 259-303.
- Newcomb, T. M. The Acquaintance Process. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1961.
- Newcomb, T. M. The prediction of interpersonal attraction. In E. P. Hollander & R. G. Hunt (Eds.), Current Perspectives in Social Psychology. (2nd ed.) New York: Oxford University Press, 1967, 292-304.
- Winch, R. F., Ktsanes T., & Ktsanes, V. The theory of complementary needs in mate selection. American Sociological Review, 1954, 19, 241-249.
- Winch, R. F. Complementary needs in mate selection: A test of one kind of complementarity. American Sociological Review, 1955, 20, 52-56.
- Wright, P. H. Personality and interpersonal attraction: Basic Assumptions. Journal of Individual Psychology, 1965, 21, 127-136.
- Wright, P. H. Need similarity, need complementarity and the place of personality in interpersonal attraction. Journal of Experimental Research in Personality, 1968, 3, 126-135.
- Wright, P. H. A model and a technique for studies of friendship. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1969, 5, 295-308. (a)
- Wright, P. H. Some new leads concerning agreement and friendship. (Unpublished work, University of North Dakota) Grand Forks, N. D., 1969. (b)
- Wright, P. H., & Crawford, A. C. Task competence and social-emotional competence as variables influencing sex differences in friendship. (Unpublished work, University of North Dakota) Grand Forks, N. D., 1969.